

Mr. SPEAKER.—We shall rise for lunch at 1 O' Clock and re-assemble at 20' Clock.

MYSORE ANIMAL DISEASES (CONTROL) BILL, 1959.

Motion to consider.

Sri N. RACHIAH (Minister for Agriculture).—I beg to move,

“That the Mysore Animal Diseases (Control) Bill, 1959, as passed by the Legislative Council be taken into consideration”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That the Mysore Animal Diseases (Control) Bill, 1959, as passed by the Legislative Council be taken into consideration.”

†Sri N. RACHIAH.—Sir, this is a very simple Bill and at the same time it is a very important Bill as Government contemplate to protect the livestock wealth in the State from all sorts of diseases, both contagious and infectious. Our country being primarily an agricultural country, livestock wealth of the State and the country plays a very important role in our food production and the production of wealth.

12-30 P. M.

So the Government desire to see this Bill becoming law. There are different enactments prevailing in the different areas of the state in regard to the prevention of diseases. This Bill has already been moved and passed in the Legislative Council and I now commend it for the kind consideration of this House.

During the third plan period the Government would give the topmost priority for the improvement of livestock because animal husbandry plays a very important role. With the increase in population of our state in particular and no country in general, we have step up food production. People are taking to non-vegetarian food more and more it is imperative that we protect animal wealth in order to make the diet wholesome. Moreover we are in dire need of large quantities of milk for consumption of our people, particularly children. All this means that we have to protect animal wealth with great care and responsibility.

Our farmers have generally been representing that their animals like cattle and sheep are not well-protected and timely help is not given with regard to the dispensation of medicines and other amenities. Therefore there is urgent and absolute necessity to see that this Bill is passed. Therefore I now request the House to give its consideration to this bill, which I consider is very important, though simple.

† Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, while speaking on this Bill I wish the Hon'ble Minister had spent a little more time in explaining a few relevant facts concerned with some of the provisions of this Bill. In the Statement of objects and Reasons it is stated that different enactments

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

are in force in the integrating areas and as such it is sought to introduce uniform and integrated legislation applicable to the entire Mysore State. It is quite a long time—nearly 4½ years. We have been accusing Government of making inordinate delay in the matter of introducing uniformity in legislation in respect of various matters. I do not know how many other Bills of this kind are still pending but in any case in a way I am happy that this Bill atleast has come to the forefront. I agree with the Hon'ble Minister that it is a very important bill, though a simple one. There seems to be an awareness on the part of the Government now, at the beginning of the third plan, that the cattle wealth of the State has got to be zealously guarded and improved. The Hon'ble Minister would have done well if he had only referred to the Quinquennial Census of Agricultural livestock. I do not know when it was taken and whether the system is still in force and what exactly is being done about it. The Minister has agreed and admitted that the cattle wealth is the mainstay of agriculturists and if agricultural production has got to be improved the ryot has got to be assured that his cattle would be safe and free from diseases.

This Bill refers to the different enactments in force in the several integrating areas. I wish the Hon'ble Minister had drawn our attention to the essential points of difference between the acts in the several integrating areas and the erstwhile Mysore State. I wonder whether this Bill is an improvement on the other Bills either individually or collectively; if it is an improvement, to what extent and in what respects. Such information would have been valuable for us to discuss this Bill in detail. This Bill notably makes an omission in regard to the mentioning of the Government's duties and responsibilities in the matter of control of diseases, in regard to the preventive measures apart from the curative measures they are suggesting. What are the provision for controlling Gornals and village pasteurs which are fertile sources for spreading infection diseases. There seems to be no mention about this at all in this Bill.

I shall now refer to the details one by one. In sub-clause (3) of clause 1, it is stated that the act shall come into force at once in the areas in which the enactments repealed by section 38 are in force; and shall come into force in any other area on such date as the State Government may, by notification specify. As to why this was found necessary we find no explanation.

In regard to the definitions in clause 2, I wish the Hon'ble Minister had avoided the word "swine" which has got a bad connotation in the English language. If you call a pig a pig it is correct but to call a pig a swine is not good. It is not a happy word. Even now if the Hon'ble Minister agrees, it is better that this word is omitted.

In regard to the definition of contagious and infectious diseases, it is a highly technical matter and I am sure that the Hon'ble Minister would agree that the definition clause is not exhaustive by any means and this

is perhaps the reason why he takes cloak under "such other diseases as may be notified..." We are aware that the majority of our ryot population is uneducated or I may call them 'illiterate' by and large. How are they to know, when it is notified in the gazette or at some place, that a particular disease is infectious. They are the people who suffer under the penalty clause. I am afraid that unless a clarification is issued from time to time and published in the vernacular language in the rural areas, the ryots are liable to be hauled up under the penal provisions of this Bill.

In clause 5 in regard to the 'power to inoculate and regulate movement of animals and to control the holding of markets, fair, etc., and traffic infective in animals', I want to know whether the word "may" can be substituted by word "shall". It should not be optional but compulsory.

Under sub-clause 1 (a) of clause 6, the local officer is given too much of a discretion, perhaps to the detriment of the affected ryot. Unless certain areas are specified as segregation areas to serve the needs of 10 or 15 villages, the problem would be difficult. Suppose an officer makes village A as a place of segregation. The obligation is cast on the affected ryot to see that the infected cattle are conveyed to that particular place. Unless these areas of segregation are made more effective, the ryot is likely to suffer the order passed would be ineffective because of his inability to transport the cattle to places 10 miles away. It is the villagers and the other cattle that would suffer. This segregation order would have to be made a little more effective than what is provided for in the Bill at present.

In regard to sub clause (5) (b) of clause 6, I think the owner of the cattle is entitled to be told that such an order is going to be passed. Supposing the Veterinary Inspector or the Veterinary Officer take it into his head that it is a very difficult case, instead of going through the process of curing it, he may say that the animal may be destroyed. He will have to give the reason and convince the poor ryot. It is better that in its own interest the animal is destroyed. For example, in the Race Course, if a horse becomes lame, with the consent of the owner we destroy it because it is no longer fit for any work. Therefore, before the Inspector orders the destruction of a particular infected animal, it is better that he records his reasons therefor and convinces the poor ryot. Of course, the ryot will not ordinarily be convinced. Even if such a provision is made, it will minimise the chances of indiscriminate destruction. I do not mean to suggest that the officers are inhuman. Wherever there is a difficult case, he may consider that it is much better that he gets rid of it.

In regard to the declaration of private infected places and examination of such places by a Veterinary Officer, you are making a distinction between an area occupied by a local authority or railway administration and a private infected place. In one case, you want

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

the Veterinary Inspector to be the entire boss of the show and he can take any action he likes but in the case of a local authority or railway administration, you have made some special provision and you are putting a senior officer. I want to know why any distinction should be made in the method of assessing a particular place as being infected between a local authority or railway administration and a private building. I should like to have a clarification from the Hon'ble Minister whether there is any special reason for this.

Sri N. RACHIAH.—We have contacted the Central Government and they have said that it would be better to provide for an officer with an higher rank in the case of a local authority and railway administration.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—If this kind of distinction is made, I am afraid it will naturally provoke a lot of heart-burning. Suppose it is a big landlord or a zamindar. The stakes so far as he is concerned are just as great as those of any local authority or railway administration. So, is there any special reason for providing for a different procedure for dealing with private infected places? After all, the private place is situated within the limits or jurisdiction of a municipality or local authority. So, why a separate procedure is necessary in their case?

Then, in sub-clause (3) it is provided that 'the Veterinary Officer shall forthwith report the action taken by him under this sub-section to the prescribed authority.' I do not know why this authority is not mentioned in the Act itself. It is very necessary that this authority is defined in the statute itself. Otherwise, it may be the Deputy Commissioner in one case, the Divisional Commissioner in a second case and the Government in a third case. Where is the difficulty in mentioning to whom this report has got to be made? There is another case in which the ryot has got to make a report to the Veterinary Inspector. The officer may be in district headquarter or taluk headquarter and the infectious disease may occur in a village 50 miles away from the taluka headquarter. With the introduction of the Village panchayats and Taluka Boards, why don't you provide for a report being made to the Village Panchayat which will take further steps by reporting it to the Veterinary Officer? Why do you make the ryot responsible for it and make him run to the Taluka headquarter or District Headquarter? I think that kind of relief is necessary. That report which the ryot is expected to make to the Veterinary Officer should be made to the Village Panchayat and the Village Panchayat should with all speed take steps to report the matter to the Veterinary Inspector or the Veterinary Officer, as the case may be.

Again, in sub-section (4) of section 7, you say that 'if the Veterinary Officer cancels the order passed by the Inspector,..... I presume that he functioning in an appellate capacity. He is passing an order on the report of the Inspector. The section does not say on what grounds cancel the order. Provision should be made for this; otherwise, he may pass any whimsical order and it may be to the detriment of the ryot.

Coming to section 10, it is with reference to this section that I said earlier that you have made no provision for dealing with gomals and pasture lands and to protect them against contamination or infection. You have only referred to 'produce of and animal, or any food, bedding or other things used in connection with the animal'. After all, the gomals and grazing grounds are the most fruitful source of infection and it is that you have to guard against. But there is no provision in this Bill for taking any steps to prevent that kind of infection spreading. So, you must also bring gomals and grazing lands also within the purview of this clause.

Then, section 16 deals with the duty of certain persons to report contagious or infectious diseases. I have already spoken about the ryot's responsibility in this matter. It is sufficient if he gives a report to the Village Panchayat. You have also made the Veterinary Practitioner to report these matters. How does a Veterinary Practitioner become liable to make a report to Veterinary Inspector? Is it his fault that he treats an animal or gives it first aid? I would not have mentioned it but for the fact that you have provided for punishment in the penal clause for failure to report. If a ryot fails to make a report, he comes within the purview of the law and can be punished. But why do you want to involve a Veterinary Practitioner? If he does not report he gets a fine of Rs. 100. It is not correct. No Veterinary Practitioner will come forward to treat the cattle in those circumstances.

Clause 18- Powers of entry and inspection.

"Subject to such rules as may be prescribed, any Inspector or Veterinary Officer may enter upon and inspect any land or building or other place,....."

In this clause unlimited powers are given whereas under clause 6, the powers given are limited. Supposing there is an infection in a place served by the railways or local authority. The officer has to write to the railways, who in turn will have to write to the General Manager and give permission to the Veterinary Officer to inspect and take suitable measure. In this process there is bound to be lot of delay and any infection or disease cannot wait. So, you must see that there is no contradiction between two sections.

In regard to penal clauses, I am afraid the Hon'ble Minister for Agriculture whom I thought was sympathetic to the ryots would not have imposed such punishment in the Bill. If one reads the Bill it will be seen that for almost every failure to comply with any provision of the Bill, there is heavy fine and imprisonment. For example, it is said.

"Whoever fails to render every facility and assistance to a Veterinary Officer as required by section 12"

The section 12 states.

"In any area or place declared to be an infected area or place under this Act, the Veterinary Officer or Inspector duly

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

authorised by the Veterinary Officer in this behalf, shall, in all cases in which preventive vaccination or inoculation is possible and practicable vaccinate or inoculate, as the case may be, such kinds or classes of animals in the area or place as may be prescribed and the owner or person in charge or having control of every such animal, shall render every facility or assistance to the Veterinary Officer or Inspector in carrying out such vaccination or inoculation."

Nowhere it is said what facility should be provided to vaccinate. Supposing a person temporarily leaves a few herds of cattle and is away from headquarters, under this Bill he is expected to give every facility. Failure to do so, he will be liable for punishment. There does not seem to be any distinction in regard to the nature of offence and every kind of act is brought under this penal clause. This will result in the harassment of people.

So far as clause 17 is concerned, the responsibility for segregating the infective animals, is not all right. It has to be that of the Government the Veterinary Inspector. You must allow a separate place for segregation.

Sri N. RACHIAH—Now the situation has changed. We will request the Village Panchayats to set apart a place. While framing rules under this Act, we will provide for all that.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Coming to sub-clause (k) of clause 22 I have already said that the limit of Rs. 500 should be lowered.

Clause 24 says:—

"Whoever brings or attempts to bring to a market, fair, exhibition or other concentration of animals, any animal which he knows or has reason to believe to be infective, shall be punished..."

How are you going to impart knowledge to the ryot as to whether an animal is suffering from infective disease? Many of the officers of the department themselves do not know from what disease an animal is suffering. So, in such cases if you impose penalty, the whole Bill will act as a harassment to the ryot. The diseases are so complicated and a ryot does not know the complexity of diseases.

Clause 23 seems to be very much against the interests of the ryots. Similarly clause 24. So far as cattle are concerned, I know that no ryot would ever take a cattle which is infective nor would remove the cattle out of the village. But if he has no knowledge of the disease and brings it to market, he would be hauled up. Such a provision would only discourage the people from participating in cattle fairs etc. This clause requires revision.

Clause 25 provides for imprisonment. I should presume that it is neither simple or rigorous. Is it your intention that a person who has violated the provisions of this Bill should undergo rigorous imprisonment as if he has committed a heinous crime? I know that damage caused due to the negligence is enormous. But is he to be imprisoned for that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise and meet after one hour.

The House adjourned for recess at One of the Clock and re assembled at Two of the Clock.

[Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I was dealing with clause 25 in which I was asking whether the imprisonment referred to was either simple or rigorous. I understand from the Hon'ble Minister that where no mention is made, it generally means simple imprisonment. I do not how, I am open to correction. I think in such cases the discretion is left to the magistrate concerned. What I am inclined to urge on this occasion is that it should not be a case of rigorous imprisonment.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—I agree with you. Generally the magistrate will take a dispassionate view and pass judgement.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—That a man should be condemned it rigorous imprisonment for any offence under this section, I do not know how far it is fair.

Coming to section 28 Sir, here is the case of an officer who acts in good faith and this section provides for convicting him and punishing him with imprisonment. I says.—

“28: *Penalty for vexatious entry, inspection or seizure.*—(1) Whoever, being an Inspector of a Veterinary Officer, appointed under this Act, vexatiously and unnecessarily enters or inspects any land, building or other place or any vessel or vehicle or seizes or detains any animal, shall, on conviction, be punished with imprisonment for a term which may extend to six months or with fine which may extend to five hundred rupees or with both.”

Please read clause 34 (2) :

“No officer or servant of State Government shall be liable in respect of any such act in any civil or criminal proceeding if the act was done in good faith in the course of the execution of his duties, or the discharge of functions imposed by or under this Act.”

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

I consider that there is a gross conflict between the two provisions Clause 28 which provides for penalty for vexatious action, and clause 34 (2) which is intended to give protection to any officer who acts in good faith. Supposing a very bad type of raiyat who has got a grouse against the veterinary officer for discharging his normal duties, he wants to put up a case against him. You are completely exposing him to the risk of being punished by a court.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—But only if he enters the place.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—He is not interested in going to a place where the cattle are not affected by any disease. In one section you give protection under 34 and in another section namely clause 28, you actually make a provision for punishing him. It is a question of opinion. I do not think if any other legislation this kind of a provision for giving up an officer is provided for. I do not know if you have got to revise this. Please think it over. Supposing a group of raiyats who do not like an officer may put him before a court. It depends on the nature of evidence. But suppose half a dozen people join together and create trouble. In that case, an officer would go into any house.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—That has to be proved to the satisfaction of the court.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—But just think what would be the reaction that is produced in any officer.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—If it is a harassment to the raiyat concerned, should there not be a measure of protection to the raiyat? Possibly, this is the only Bill which providing some protection to the person concerned.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—What I say is, under clause 34 protection is given to an officer, but under clause 28, it hands over the person to the court. At that rate, it becomes very difficult for any person to work with any interest or zeal. It is not a matter of pleasure for him to go into the house another person and give a declaration that the place is infected or give an order in respect of diseased cattle there. But the man is going to be hauled up before a court. You know it is very difficult to prove vexatious acts. Harassment is still there. But the officer has got to keep on going to court and it interferes with his normal business.

Clause 31 says: "No magistrate shall take cognisance of an offence under this Act, except upon the complaint or report of a Veterinary Officer." It looks as if the Law Department has not looked into the incongruity. What about clause 28? The man concerned if a Veterinary Officer. Clause 31 of the Act provides for a Magistrate taking cognisance of no offence except under the report of a Veterinary

Officer. Clause 28 contemplates, it is the veterinary officer who is complained against. That means, the magistrate cannot take cognisance of it. How are you going to explain this incongruity?

These are certain general observations which I wish to make in connection with the Bill itself. There are one or two other observations which I would like to make in this connection. This Bill completes the void in regard to the responsibility of the Government to prevent the spread of disease. You say, you are doing preventive inoculation. What other preventive measures you are going to take it is mentioned nowhere in the Bill. It is all penalising the raiyat from top to bottom. A Government which swears on the welfare of the raiyat, makes a chapter like chapter IV—clauses 29 to 36. It hardly shows any indication of the interest of the Government in the raiyat. I am sorry to say that.

However, I would like to know what happened to the Bill of 1948 in regard to the castration of scrub Bills which was in operation in Mysore State. It was one of those negative measures taken by the then Government of Mysore to improve the breed of cattle. The first step adopted to improve the breed of cattle was to get rid of undesirable ones. I want to know whether that Bill is still in operation.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—It is before the other House.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In regard to one other matter; you have referred to this danger about the mosquito bite. I am aware in certain villages mosquitos which bite cattle, come and bite people also and some of the doctors said it leads to a very gruesome disease. They have not yet been able to diagnose the disease which comes as a result of the mosquito biting a human being which has in the first instance bitten cattle. I want to know if there is anything done, to show whether the Department has designed any virus to see that this kind of disease does not spread to the human beings.

I am not aware of any such thing. When the mosquito first bites the cattle and then the human being—I understand that it is a very deadly thing.

Then, Sir, in regard to the Serum Institute, I know that the Serum Institute in Mysore, is doing actually good work. But we have not seen in the departmental reports of the Veterinary Department what progress the Institute has made in doing some useful work by way of scientific and biological research. When Government is so solicitous in regard to the welfare of the rural folk, I want to know what positive measures have been undertaken during the first and Second Five-Year plans to improve the breed of cattle. You know what these cattle fairs are doing. I am afraid I do not want to be very critical. Beyond giving occasions for Ministers to visit, I would like to ask whether the cattle fairs have been of any great help in improving the breed of cows. Is there any cattle fair where twenty heads of cows are exhibited? Even in a place

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

like Subramanya Ghati, where forty to fifty thousand heads of cattle are exhibited, you cannot have fifty heads of cows. You were pleased to make an observation that you are anxious to see that the supply of milk throughout the State is increased and that the breed of cows is improved. But I see no positive measures pursued either in the first, second or third plans. It is one of the standing complaints against Government that they do not do anything positive. You have brought this measure. I would only say that the measure has been brought as if you want to penalise the people. It is no doubt a very laudable enterprise to arrest the spread of the disease. It is alright. But you do not make any positive measure. This Bill is purely one-sided. It is as if you want to punish the people, and beyond that there is nothing either in regard to the improvement of cattle wealth or to improve the breed of cattle and things of that kind. So far as the new preparation of serum and drugs are concerned, I want to know what the Serum Institute is doing. It is not within the easy reach of the ryot so far as these preventive measures are concerned. If the villager goes to the Veterinary Officer and places before him the spread of the disease in his area, he will say that he is busy in the other area. The existing Act is not functioning satisfactorily. Except that you want to punish the people, there is nothing positive. This is my one standing grievance.

In regard to the registering of cattle in each village—you refer to the Bill—I want to know (this is the basis for the preparation of the quinquennial census of agricultural stock) on whom does this responsibility of maintaining the registers will fall now. Will it be transferred to the Village Panchayat or to whom else? You are now abolishing the Village Patels and Shanbhogues. Then necessarily it has to be maintained by the Village Panchayat. The maintenance of registers, the responsibility for even reporting the death and birth of cattle will have to lay with the Village Panchayat itself. Just as you maintain the register of births and deaths of human beings, it is very necessary for the Village Panchayats to maintain registers for the progress made in improving cattle wealth.

I wish to make another suggestion in regard to the maintenance of Veterinary Hospitals. Mysore took pride, in the erstwhile Mysore State before integration, that Mysore was the one State, where for a determined number of cattle, the number of hospitals was the highest. I do not know if the position continues to be the same today.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—We have reached the figure of 27,000 for one hospital.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—That means, a lot of leeway has to be covered. In regard to the provision of hospitals—Veterinary Dispensaries and Hospitals, you ought to agitate. The unit must be the taluk, but the hospital must be centrally located.

Take a taluk like Shimoga. If you have it at the taluk headquarters in Shimoga taluk, there are villages at a distance of about 45 miles from taluk headquarters and the hospital or dispensary at taluk headquarters will not serve the needs of the village. You locate the hospital...

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—Where there is a concentration of cattle wealth !

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I agree. If you are going to locate the dispensary or the hospital where there is concentration of cattle wealth, nobody can have a grievance. Merely to give the taluk headquarters all importance, you cannot locate the hospitals there.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—Even in certain Hobli headquarters there are veterinary hospitals—in old Mysore.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In regard to the provision of trained personnel, salastries, I do not know if you have prescribed any Course. If these people have got to be in charge of enforcement of the provisions of this particular Bill, unless you train them, I think you are doing a positive injustice to the entire ryot community. I want to know what arrangements have been made to have trained personnel for various hospitals. In this matter we are very much behind the schedule.

Then, Sir while talking about gomal lands, it is said that the spread of the disease is only from the gomal lands and pastures. But the Government either in the Agricultural Department or the Revenue Department have done precious little. The gomal lands are the worst maintained. They are arid and unhealthy. It is laid down in the revenue law that for every 100 heads of cattle, 30 acres of gomal land would be provided. But in the majority of the villages, these thirty acres of land are taken away and given for cultivation. Even the few acres of land that remain is unhealthy and filthy and even you cannot have access to this area. Unless you make those gomal lands fertile, which are now being neglected, unless positive measures are taken, you cannot prevent sources of infection from spreading to the cattle from these so called gomal lands and pastures. Most of the cattle stray to these gomal lands, which are not healthy. They will catch the infection. Unless you make provision for village gomal lands, there is no possibility of giving any relief to the ryot.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—The Farmers' Forum are willing to raise pastures on these gomal lands if the Government are willing. What are your views ?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I do not know why the Farmers' Forum should take this work. In every village, the raising of the pastures in gomal is the responsibility of the Village Panchayat. The Village Panchayat should take the responsibility for its gomal land. If you want to inculcate ideas of self-Government, you must go the whole hog. I do not know why you should not give the responsibility of maintaining the gomal lands and raising pastures therein to the village panchayat. Do you mean to say that the village panchayat cannot manage its gomal.

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

Well let farmers' forums be formed in the village panchayat itself. Let that be a centre for disseminating knowledge for the farmers in the village. I am against any outside agency. If you like the Farmers' Forum may open a branch in every village, in every hobli and in every taluk headquarters. But I am not for any interference. Who will have more interest in the gomal land than the villagers of the village themselves, especially when it is in the interests of the village cattle?

In the third plan, simultaneously with the passing of the Bill in spite of the criticism some of us make, you must take positive measures to improve the cattle. Otherwise Government will expose themselves to the criticism that they have neglected making provisions for the improvement of agricultural production; and the ryot who is getting five acres, *per capita* distribution of land, does not have a pair of bullocks and a cow, I am afraid, no agricultural production will take place.

With these remarks, I close my observation. I would like the Hon'ble Minister to remove some of the clauses which are calculated positively to harass the ryots I am rather surprised that the Agricultural Minister, who is known to have sympathy with the ryot, should have piloted this Bill. I am equally sorry that it has strengthened his hand by the Legislative Council passing it. I do not wish to pass any observations except to say that the rigour of the penal clauses should be removed as far as possible.

2-30 P.M.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I shall make only a few observations in support of what Mr. Mallaradhy already said.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I forgot to say this. Section 30 where a police officer can arrest everybody and anybody for any offence under this section without even a warrant is one of these very objectionable clauses which should be removed from this Bill.

"Any police officer not below the rank of a sub-Inspector may, at the request in writing of a Veterinary Officer, arrest without warrant any person who has been concerned in any offence under this Act."

However laudable your intentions might be, I am sorry to say I cannot associate myself with such an omnibus provision in a Bill of this kind dealing with ryots to allow a police officer to arrest anybody without a warrant. Is it a cognizable offence? Supposing I fail to report the occurrence of infectious disease in respect of some cattle. Any blooming sub-Inspector can come and arrest me without a warrant. This is one of these sections with reference to which I am very much perturbed. Supposing the man comes and arrests a ryot. Then all undesirable methods have to be resorted to extricate himself from the clutches of the law. The police officer may be honest; but look at the

among it of harassment caused to the ryot if he fails to make a report either by oversight or by some mistake. Is he to be arrested and produced before a Magistrate and then he is to offer bail. Such a state of affairs is some thinkable. That is why I say that some of the provisions are fantastic. Whatever provisions are objectionable, you must yourselves move for their deletion.

†Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I fully endorse the observations made by Mr. Mallaradhy and I shall be very brief since he has already covered most of the grounds pertaining to this Bill. Of course, the object of the Bill is said to be 'control of animal diseases.' This question of control of animal diseases has to be approached from a fundamental angle and also from a social angle. That particular aspect has not been kept in mind either by the Government or the framers of this Bill. what I say is, such a communicable disease such as is mentioned in section 2 (b) cannot be tackled in an individualistic manner making the ryot responsible, but it should be tackled by the department. But I am saying that in the context of the immensity of the problem the resources that are placed at the disposal of the veterinary officers, whether in terms of qualified persons or administrative set up are certainly inadequate. After all, this is not a new Bill. A similar Bill has been in force for a considerable number of years. Even as it is, we have not been able to tackle the problem. That means, it is *prima facie* clear that the problem is quite large and such a problem should not be tackled on an individualistic basis. The Government or the framers of the Bill have not given adequate attention to this aspect. I am having in view the question of cattle insurance. We see to-day that is the trend. The other day we have seen that the State employees Insurance Corporation has been entrusted with the task of fighting diseases and giving adequate protection to workers suffering from various diseases. The central idea behind all that is that such communicable diseases or such preventive measures can best be tackled in an overall manner and not merely in the manner set out in the Bill. Cattle insurance is a most important thing. If that principle is accepted, the responsibility is distributed throughout the society in an equitable way, whereas here as pointed out by Mr. Mallaradhy, a person who either through ignorance or due to economic difficulties is not able to provide sufficient medicine or is not able to provide all arrangements to prevent the eruption of disease, is made responsible and you penalise him for an act of ignorance or an act of indifference. Even incometax legislation and other legislation the penal clauses are not so severe as is contemplated in a measure which is supposed to have social objects. This is something which is extraordinary. You can look to any of the other legislations—income-tax-legislation, sales tax legislation: even there there are certain measures which seem to indicate that consideration is shown to the person who comes within the ambit of the law. For example, here a veterinary officer can enter any building. In income-tax legislation, one can enter the building only before sunset. At least such consideration is

(Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN)

shown even in the case of a sales tax assessee who is expected to pay something to the State, but here that is not the position. How is it that such elementary things did not strike the Government who is supposed to strive for the welfare of the nation. What was the hurry in getting the Bill and spending some time of the House. There are already seven laws in force. Is there. Is there any difficulty experienced in the administration of law. Is it anticipated that there is such a break out of these diseases in the near future as to compel the Government to think it necessary to bring a Bill of this kind and take some time of the House. Are there not Bills which are more urgent in character either of social type or taxation; why is it that those things are not brought.

Endorsing the suggestions made by Mr. Mallaradhya, I would like to point out those things omitted by him. Section 3(2) refers to a person duly qualified in veterinary medicine. If he passes compounders' test, does he become a duly qualified officer? Nowhere is it said what exactly is to be a duly qualified officer. This would naturally lead to litigation and confusion. I do not see any reason why this elementary thing was omitted by the Government.

Under section 6, the intention appears to be to subject the owner to unnecessary harassment. Under section 6(1) (b), the owner's responsibility is to subject the particular cattle to such treatment as may be specified in the order. I do not know if it is envisaged that the Government will meet the cost of any particular treatment. May be, they will supply serum or certain medicine: but the entire treatment as envisaged in the order of the veterinary officer may not mean only this. When there is a communicable disease, when you say it is a dangerous disease, it is the duty of the Government to do everything in power not merely to eradicate it but to see that means are provided for owners to help to eradicate the disease. It should not be left purely to the individual's capacity or means to provide all these medicines or all other treatment that the veterinary officer deems necessary. It is the duty of the Government to provide all the necessary means to give this treatment.

Sir, 6 (b) is important from another point of view. Supposing, a person is not in a position economically to give this treatment to the cattle immediately; immediately he comes within the mischief of the Act and the penal clause can be taken advantage of by the Veterinary Officer or the officer who enforces this law.

Then, Sir, I am not able to understand the real purport or the real purpose of the clause 6 (5) (b) and 6 (5) (c). If the Veterinary Officer certifies that animal is affected with infectious disease, the Inspector shall destroy the animal. It may be possible to cure the animal either by segregation or some other treatment. Supposing, in a particular place, a Veterinary Officer feels he is not able to provide the animal with adequate treatment; then, very easily, he may say that it may be destroyed. The moment the animal catches infectious disease, the

whole thing passes from the purview of the owner to the Inspector and he will be the deciding factor, Supposing the owner is prepared to give the treatment required but the officer is not able to provide with that treatment, or that medicine. What should happen? I do not think that such a clause could ever be permitted in any act.

Sir, regarding the power of entry, I am afraid, it is far beyond what is required or what is justified in terms of the object which this statute seeks to sub-serve. Why should such a power of entering any place at any time be given? The officer need not even bother of the privacy of the person concerned. This is an extra-ordinary clause. I am not saying that the Veterinary Officers would always abuse the power. But such action by him is possible. The framers of the Bill themselves have envisaged such a situation. Normally, it is for us to say that such a clause should have been there in Acts like Sales-tax etc. I am really surprised that very little relief is provided for a situation where the Veterinary Officer might have to be prosecuted for such an entry. What that is the position, why should you provide clause 18?

Coming to clause 27, the defence of the Government may be that they must trust the Veterinary Officer and Law Officer to implement the act honestly. We shall take it for whatever it is worth. But, should they not, in turn, expect the raiyat also to act in some honest way? If he does not do it, it may be due to ignorance and sheer economic difficulty. After all, ignorance could not be cured by legislation. So, I cannot understand for such a severe clause like 27 where a person who sells an animal which he knows is suffering from infectious disease is subjected to prosecution. Supposing he does know it and he sells; there is nothing wrong. I do not understand how the object of the Bill is defeated. Only thing is, he may try to get away with some money which he has invested on the animal. He may be penalised for not reporting the matter to the Veterinary Officer. But, if he sells and somebody is prepared to buy, what is wrong? You may say, he is cheating the other person. After all, there are several other transactions like this which are not taken cognisance of at all. I do not see any reason why such a clause should be there. Regarding clause 30, it is only during war time that there was some restriction on the movement of cattle from district to district. But, now I do not think there is any such restriction. If that is there, all the normal rights would also be interfered and it would mean un-necessary harassment. I know there is a protection that it is a person not below the rank of a Sub-Inspector that that arrest without warrant. I am afraid whether he would have sufficient time to look into such things.

Sir, with these words I close my observations.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ (ಗುಬ್ಬಿ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ದನ, ಕರ, ಕುರಿಮರಿ, ಹಂದಿ, ನಾಯಿ, ಈ ಪ್ರಾಣಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಉದಾತ್ತವಾದ ಭಾವನೆಯನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಈಗ ಸರಕಾರದವರು “The Mysore Animal Diseases (Control) Bill, 1959” ಎನ್ನುವ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತಂದು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಇದು ರಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಷನ್

(ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುತ್ತುಸ್ವಾಮಿ)

ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾಸಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಿಟ್ಟು ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾದುದು, ಬಹಳ ಸಿಂಪಲ್‌ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಎಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಚಿವರು ಹೇಳಬಿಟ್ಟು ಇದನ್ನು ಕೂಡಲೇ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂದು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಇಂಗ್ಲಿಷಿನವರು ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರ ಮಾಡಿದ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿಜಿಟಿಸ್, ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದ್ದರು. ಅದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಾಗ ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಟರುಗಳು ಅದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಅದರ ಸೀತಬಾಧೆಗಳೇನು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಚಳುವಳಿಗಾರರು ಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಅನುಕೂಲಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಮಾರ್ಗವನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಆಲೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿ ಅಂತಹ ಒಂದು ಆಕ್ಟ್‌ನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದರು. ಅದು ಕೂಡ ಈಗ ತಂದಿರುವ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಂತೆ ಕ್ರೂರವಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ದನ, ಕರ, ಕುರಿಮರಿ, ಹಂದಿ, ಮುತ್ತುನಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವಂತಹ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದು ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡುಬಿಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರವೇತ್ತರು, ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ನ್ಯಾಯ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರವನ್ನು ಅಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಹ ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವಿಲೇರೈದ್ರವಿಪಾಟಿಲರ್ ಅವರು ಮತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಜತ್ತಿಯವರು, ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ದನ, ಕರ, ಕುರಿಗಳ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತರಬಹುದೇ ಎಂದು ನನಗನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ಈ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಪೆನಾಲ್ಟಿ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್‌ನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಎದೆ ಹಾರಿಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ದನವನ್ನು ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಡಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ, ದನಕರುಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾಯುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಹಿಡಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ಅಂತಹವರನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡುಹೋಗಿ ಶಿಕ್ಷಿಸಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದರೆ ಕೊಳೆತ ಎಲೆನು ಮತ್ತು ಕೊಳೆತ ಮಾಂಸ ತಿನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಜೀವಂತ ವಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ದನಗಳನ್ನು ಕಡಿಯುತ್ತೇವೆ ಅಂದರೆ ಆಗ ಆದಕ್ಕೂ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನು ಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಈ 16 ಪುಟಗಳಿಂದ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಜನತೆ ನೋಡಿದ್ದಾದರೆ ಇವರೇನು ಮುನೋಲಿಯೋ, ಮುಸರ್ಯಾನೋ, ಮೊಗಲರೋ ಅಥವಾ ಪಠಾಣರೋ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರಲ್ಲಾ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾರಿ ಗಾದರೂ ಅನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಡಿಕ್ಟೇಟರ್ ಆಗಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರಲ್ಲಾ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ದನಕರುಗಳಿಗೇ ಆಗಲೇ ಅಥವಾ ಇನ್ನಾವ ಪ್ರಾಣಿಗಳಿಗೇ ಆಗಲೇ ಚಪ್ಪೆ ರೋಗ ಅಥವಾ ಹಂದಿರೋಗವೋ ಅಥವಾ ಇನ್ನಾವುದಾದರೂ ಕಾಯಿರ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಯಾರಾದರೂ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಸಿಮ್ಲಾ ಮೈದ್ಯಕೀಯ ಶಾಲೆಗೆ ಡಾಕ್ಟರನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಎಂದು ಕಾಗದ ಬರೆದರೆ, ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಡಾಕ್ಟರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಕಾಲ್‌ಮಾಸ್ಟರ್ ಇಲ್ಲ, ಕಾಂಪೌಂಡರು ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಇರಾಬೆಯವರನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಪ್ರಾಣಿಗಳು ಸತ್ತಿಹೋಗತಕ್ಕ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರೆ ಸತ್ತಿಹೋಗಲು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಿಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಯಾರೂ ಮುತುವರ್ಜಿ ಶ್ರದ್ಧೆ, ವಹಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಗೋಸಂಪತ್ತನ್ನು, ಪ್ರಾಣಿ ಸಂಪತ್ತನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಪಶು ಸಂಪತ್ತನ್ನು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಯಿರೆಗಳಿಂದ ದೂರ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ತರುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ನಿನ್ನೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಕಾನೂನು ಕಳೆಗೆ ಯಾರ್ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಅವರು ಎನೇನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನೇ ತಿಳಿಯದೆ ಇರುವ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅರಿವು ಉಂಟಾಗಲು ನನ್ನ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಿತ್ರರಾದ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಸುದೀರ್ಘವಾದ ಗಮನವನ್ನು ದನ ಕರುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಕುವವರ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಗಮನ ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಆ ಕಡೆಗೆ ತಿರುಗಬೇಕು. ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬಹುದು ದನಗಳ ಜಾತ್ರೆಯನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ರೈಸೆನ್ ಬೇಕು ಆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಮೊರನರಿ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರ್‌ಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಆತ ಚಪ್ಪೆರೋಗ ಹಂದಿರೋಗ

ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಕಾಯಿರೆ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ದನಗಳನ್ನು ಪಾತ್ರೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಸಾಕು. ಕೂದರೆ ಜನ ಏನಾದರೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ರೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುವಂತಿತಿ ಈಗ ಇದೆ. ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ, ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳೂ ಅಂತಿ ದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಂದ ಇಂತಹ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಇವರಿಂದ ಬಹುತೇಕ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ನೋಡ ಬೇಕು. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಗೂ ತಿಳಿಸ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಪಾತ್ರೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರತಕ್ಕ ದನಗಳು ಕೆಲವುಜೇಳೆ ಜೋಳದ ಸಿಪ್ಪೆ ತಿಂದು ಸತ್ತು ಹೋಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಆಗ ವೆಟರಿನರಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯವರು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಜನೋ ರೋಗ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಕಾಯಿರೆ ಬಂದಂಥ ದನವನ್ನು ಪಾತ್ರೆಗೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾನೆಂದು ಆತನನ್ನು ಫೋಲಿಸ್‌ಸೇಷನ್‌ಗೆ ನಡೆ ಎಂದು ಕರೆದು ಹೋಗುವುದು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಅನೇಕಜೇಳೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆ; ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ದನಗಳು ಊರಿನ ಸುತ್ತಲೂ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಜೋಳದ ತಿರುಳು ತಿಂದು ನೆಗೆಯುತ್ತಾ ನೆಗೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಮೂರ್ಛ ಬಿದ್ದು ಸೊಕ್ಕೆತ್ತಿ ಬೀಳುವುದು ಸ್ವಾಭಾವಿಕ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಪಟೀಲನಿಗೇನಾದರೂ ಹೋರಿ ಸಾಕಿರುವವನ ವೇಲೆ ದ್ವೇಷದಿಂದ ಆ ಪಟೀಲ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅವನನ್ನು ಪುನ ರಾಯಿಸಿ ಕೋರಿಸಾಕಿರುವವನಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲದ ಸಲ್ಲದ ಹಿಂಸೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ನಿದರ್ಶನಗಳು ಬೇಕಾದವಿವೆ. ನೀವು ಈ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಜಾರಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಚಾಪೆಕೆಳಗೆ ಹೋಗು ತ್ತೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ರಂಗೋಲೆ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋ ಸ್ವರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇಂತಹ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಮೊದಲನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಅದರ ಫೋಯೋದ್ದೇಶಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕೈಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಈ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳು ದುರುಪಯೋಗವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಯಾಕೆಂದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿನ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿ ಗಳು ಯಾರೂ ಪಾಕಿಸ್ತಾನ ಮತ್ತು ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡಿನಿಂದ ಬಂದವರಲ್ಲ. ದೇಶಾಭಿಮಾನದಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ರೈತರ, ಬಡಜನರು ಏನಾದರೂ ತಪ್ಪುಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಯಾವುದೇ ಬಗೆಬಗೆಯಿಂದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆದಿರಬೇಕೇ ಹೊರತು ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯ ದ್ವೇಷವನ್ನು ಅವರಮೇಲೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಹುಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಹಿಂಸೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಹಾ ನುಪಾವನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಇರಬಾರದು. ಅಂತಹ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಏನು ಮಾಡ ಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸುದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಾದ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನರಸಿಂಹ ಅಪರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ನಾನೂ ಸಹ ಇದರೊಳಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಯಾರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ಪ್ರತ್ಯಮಾಡಿ ಕೇಳ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಸೇಲ್ಸ್ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಇನ್‌ಕಂ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ನಂತೆ ಈ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳಿಂದ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಮನೋಭಾವವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಇಟ್ಟು ಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಬಾರದು. ಸೂರ್ಯಾಸ್ತವಾಗಿ ಬೆಳಕು ಆಗುವುದರೊಳಗೆ ನಿನ್ನ ಪ್ರಾಣಿಯನ್ನು ಬೇರೆಕಡೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ರಾತ್ರಿ 2 ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಮನೆಗೆ ಬಂದು ನಮ್ಮ ಹೋರಿ ಕಾಯಿರೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿರಿಸಕೂದದು ಎಂದು ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಜನತೆಗೆ ಹಿಂಸೆ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇರೆ 80 ವರ್ಷದ ಮುದುಕ ಕಾಯಿರೆಯಿಂದ ಸರಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೂ ಆತನ ಕಡೆ ಗಮನ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಕಾಣಿಸಿದೆ ಈ ಹೋರಿಯನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಸಾಗಿಸಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಆತ ಗಮನಿಸಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಬಹುತೇಕ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗಬಾರದು ಎಂಬ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಆಲೋಚಿಸಬೇಕು. ಆ ಕಾನೂನು ಗಳೂ ಸಹ ಸರಳವಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಅದರಿಂದ ಜನ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗಬೇಕು. ಜನತೆಯು ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಈಡೇರಿಬೇಕು ಎಂಬಂತಂಥ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಇದರೊಳಗೆ ಅಳವಡಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲವು

(ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಬಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ)

ಕಾಲುಜುಗಲು ಜನತೆಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡುವಹಾಗಿ ಇದೆ. ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಇವರು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳ ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಅವು ಲಬಿವಿಲ್ಲದ ಹಾಗಿ ಇದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಬಹುತೇಕ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಉಪಯೋಗಕರವಾಗುವ ಹಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಯಾವನಾದರೂ ಒಬ್ಬ ದ್ವೇಷದಿಂದ ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬನ ದನ, ಹಂದಿ, ಕುರಿ, ಮೇಕೆ, ನಾಯಿ, ಕೋಳಿ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಪ್ರಾಣಿಗಳನ್ನು ಭರ್ಜಿಯಿಂದ ತಿವಿದು ಕೊಂದುಹಾಕಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೇನು ಕಾಯಿಲೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎಂದು ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಆಗ ಆ ಪ್ರಾಣಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಕಿದವನು ರೋಗದ ಪ್ರಾಣಿಗಳನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾನೆಂದು ಆರ್ಟನ್ನು ಶಿಕ್ಷೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು -ಹೀಗೆ ಆ ಊರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವನಿಗೆ ಆಗದೇ ಇರುವವನ ಮೇಲೆ ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಬೆಂಕಿ ಹಚ್ಚುವುದು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯತಕ್ಕ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಆನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವ ಹಾಗಿ ಈಗಿನ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳು ಆಗುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಅವರ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿರುವ ಹಾಗಿ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇವರು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಎಲ್ಲ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳೂ ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದ ತಕ್ಕಡೆಯಲ್ಲಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಬರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಒಂದು ಶತಮಾನ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳಿಂದ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದರೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಕಾನೂನುಗಳ ದುರುಪಯೋಗ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಯಾವುದೇ ಕಾಯಿದೆ, ಕಟ್ಟಳೆ ನಿಯಮಗಳು ಸರಳವಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಜನಗಳನ್ನು ಕಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿಸಿ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಷ್ಕಾರವಾಗಬೇಡಿ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಅಂತಹ ಭವಿಷ್ಯವನ್ನು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಡಿ. ಆದರೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಒಂದುಸಾರಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಹಿರಿಯನಾಯಕರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ವೀರಣ್ಣ ಗಾಡರು ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಮೆಟಿನ್‌ನಿ ಡಾಕ್ಟರುಗಳು ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಹೋಬಳಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್‌ನಲ್ಲೂ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಎಲ್ಲೋ ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಸೌಕರ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಪಶು ಸಂಪತ್ತು, ಪ್ರಾಣಿ ಸಂಪತ್ತನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಇರುವಾಗ, ಅವುಗಳ ಕಾಯಿಲೆಗಳನ್ನು, ರೋಗರುಜಿನಗಳನ್ನು ದೂರ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾದ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಮನೋವೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆಳವಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದಿರುವಾಗ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಸ್ವಾಸ್ಥ್ಯಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಮೆಟಿನ್‌ನಿ ಆಫೀಸರುಗಳೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಬೆಪಿಡಿ ಮೊದಲೇ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಂತಹ ಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಇರುವಾಗ ಹೋಬಳಿ, ಹೆಡ್‌ಕ್ವಾರ್ಟರ್‌ಸುಗಳೆಲ್ಲರತ್ತ ದನಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಾಯಿಲೆ ಬಂದರೆ ಆ ಕಾಯಿಲೆಯನ್ನು ದೂರ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಡ ರೈತರು ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅದು ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಒಂದುದಿನ ಒಂದು ಊರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸತ್ತುಹೋಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಾದರೆ ಆ ದನ ಸಾಕುವವನು ಆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಹತ್ತಿರದಲ್ಲರತ್ತ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಸರ್‌ಜಿನ್‌ಕ್ವೆರರ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಆ ರೀತಿ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದರ ಅವನು ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾನೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಅವನನ್ನು ಅರೆಸ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್‌ಗೆ ನಡೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾನೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಆದರೆ ಪ್ರತಿ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲೂ ಏನೇನು ಆನಾಹುತ ಉಂಟಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಬಹಳ ಉದಾತ್ತ ಧೈಯವನ್ನುಳ್ಳ ಮತ್ತು ಬಹಳ ಎಶಾಲ ಮಾನೋಭಾವ ಇರುವ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಪ್ರಾಣಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಯಿಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಸಿಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾದ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಮನೋವೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆಳವಡಿಸಬೇಕು. ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ತಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಜನತೆಗೆ ಸರಳವಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಆ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸರಳವಾಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಗೆ ತರುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮನೋವೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆಳವಡಿಸಬೇಕು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸುದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಆಲೋಚನೆ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಮನೂವೆಯುಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾರಿಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ಎಷ್ಟು ಹಣಬರ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಬೇಕಾಗಬಹುದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ವೆಟರಿನರಿ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಟ್ ವೆಟರಿನರಿ ಅಫೀಸ್ ಎಂದು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಒಂದೊಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿಗೂ ಒಬ್ಬೊಬ್ಬ ವೆಟರಿನರಿ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಟ್ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಒಂದೊಂದು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್‌ಗೆ ಅನಿವಾರ್ಯ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದರ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯೊಂದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನ ವೆಟರಿನರಿ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಟುಗಳು, ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನ ವೆಟರಿನರಿ ಅಫೀಸರುಗಳು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಆರೋಪಿಸಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ವೆಟರಿನರಿ ಅಫೀಸರಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ವೆಟರಿನರಿ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಟಿಗೂ ಇರುವ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವೇನಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಸಹ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಅಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಇವರ ಕೈಗೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿದರೆ ಸಾಕು ಅದು ಪೊಲೀಸರ ಕೈಗೂ ಕೊನೆಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಗೆಜೆಟ್ ರಾಂಕ್ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಅಫೀಸರುಗಳು ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಫೈನರ್ ಪವರ್ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಶ್ರಮಿಸಿದರೆ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಸ್ಕೂಟಿನಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಅಥವಾ ರೈಲು ಈ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಎಫೆಕ್ಟಿವ್‌ಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಜನತೆಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಯೋಚಿಸಬೇಕು. ವೆಟರಿನರಿ ಅಫೀಸರುಗಳಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ವೆಟರಿನರಿ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಟುಗಳಾಗಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಸ್ನೇಟಸ್ ಜನು, ಅವರು ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಗೆಜೆಟ್ ಅಥವಾ ನಾನ್-ಗೆಜೆಟ್ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಯಾಕೆಂದರೆ ಪಜೀಲನಾಗಲಿ, ಶ್ಯಾನು ಬೋಗನಾಗಲಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಮೆಂಬರಾಗಲಿ, ಅಥವಾ ಅಸೆಂಟ್ ಮೆಂಬರ್ ಆಗಲಿ ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಒಳ್ಳೆ ಕಂಪ್ಲೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಅದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಮನೂವೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸತ್ಯಾ ಸತ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಇಬ್ಬರ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕೈಸೇರಿ ಒಡವರಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಸುದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇಷ್ಟು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇರಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಮನೂವೆಯು ಫೈನು ಫೋರಂಗಳನ್ನು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ನನ್ನ ಕೆಲವು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಪೆನಾಲ್ಟಿ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದು ಅಫೆನ್ಸಿವ್ ಮತ್ತು ಪನಿಷ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್. ಈ ಮನೂವೆಯಲ್ಲಿನ ಕೆಲವು ಕ್ಲಾಜುಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ನ್ಯಾಯಶಾಸ್ತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾರಂಗತವಾದವರು ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೋರ್ಟು ಕಚೇರಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಏಕೀಕರಣ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಸುವವರಿಗಂತೂ ಮಹದಾನಂದ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ವೆಂಕಟೇಗೌಡ.—ಅಂತವುಗಳು ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಬಂದರೆ ಅಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಬಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಸ್ವ.—ಇನ್ನು 11ನೇ ಪುಟದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28-ಈ ಕ್ಲಾಜುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸುದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಮೊಟ್ಟ ಮೊದಲನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚಿಸಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನವರು ಅದನ್ನು ಕಿತ್ತು ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾರೆ.

3-00 P. M.

ತಾವು ಈ ಪೆನಾಲ್ಟಿ ಕ್ಲಾಜನ್ನೂ ಅಂದರೆ ಕ್ಲಾಜ್ 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 ಮತ್ತು 28-ವರೆಗೂ ಈ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕ್ಲಾಜುಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಬರೆದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಅಂದರೆ ಈ ಶೆಕ್ರೆಟೇರಿಯೇಟಿನಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಆ ರಾ-ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಗಳೂ ಆ ಅಡಿಪದರ್ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ)

ಗೃಹ ತರೇಲ ಏನಾದರೂ ಬುದ್ಧಿ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅಥವಾ ಬುದ್ಧಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೇಳಿದರೆ “ನಾವು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕಾನೂನು ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳನ್ನೂ ಓದಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು” ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಅವರು ಓದಿರುವುದರ ಪರಿಣಾಮ ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಒಂದಾವರ್ತಿ ಆಗುವುದು ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಪುನಃ ಅದೇ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೊಂದಾವರ್ತಿ ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದು ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂತ ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಈ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟೇರಿಯೇಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಜಡ್ಜ್, ಮುನ್ಸೀಫ್ ಮತ್ತು ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಜಡ್ಜ್ ರಾಗತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಜನಗಳೆಲ್ಲ ಇದ್ದಾಗ್ಯೂ ಅಂಥವರು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಕಾನೂನು ತಯಾರಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಕಾನೂನು ನ್ನು ಅದರಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಸಂಯೋಜನೆಯೇ ಅಥವಾ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಸ್ಕೂಟಿನ ಸಹ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಪೀಗಾದುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಾನೇ ಈ ಜನರು ತಯಾರಿಸಿದ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳು ಇದೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟಿನ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೋಗಿ ತೆರೆಕೆಳಗಾದದ್ದು? ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಓದಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳೂ ಓದಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಈ ಶಾಸನಸಭಾ ಸಭೆಯೂ ಓದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಓದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇಲ್ಲ ಜನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. Penalty for keeping or grazing infective animals in unenclosed land ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಕ್ಷರಸ್ಥರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ನೂರಕ್ಕೆ ಏಳಿದೆ? ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಕಾನೂನು ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಮೈಸೂರು ಗೆಜೆಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಮೂರೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದುಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದು ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವ ಬಗೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ಆತ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂತ ಏನಾದರೂ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ignorance of Law is no excuse ಎಂತ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು ತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆಗ ಆ ಅನ್ವಯವನ್ನಾದ ರೈತನ ಗತಿ ಏನಾಗಬೇಕು? ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಚಲಿಸುಗೋಪನೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಈ ಕಾನೂನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಆ ಒಂದು ಗೆಜೆಟ್ ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಸೇರೆ ಏನು ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದರೂ ಇಂಥ ಬಿಲ್ಲುಗಳಿಗೆ ತಾವು ಸೈನು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ನೋಡುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ ಎಂತ ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಆತುರದಲ್ಲಿ ಡೈಗೋ ಎಲ್ಲೆಗೋ ಹೊರಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸಮಯವನ್ನೇ ಕಾವಿದ್ಧು ಅಂಥಾ ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲೇ ಇಂಥಾ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಅವರ ಮುಂದಿಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆಗ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಆ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನೇನಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ನೋಡದೆ ಆ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ “B.D.J.” ಎಂತ ಸೈನ್ ಮಾಡಿಬಿಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ ಅವರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆನಾದರೂ ಇಂಥಾ ಅನಾಹುತ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನಡೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾದರೆ ಆಗ ಅವರು “ಅಯ್ಯೋ ನನ್ನ ಗತೀ ಮುಗಿತು. ನಾನು ಆ ಡೈಗ್ ಹೋಗೋ ಆತುರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೈನ್ ಮಾಡಿಬಿಟ್ಟೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಕ್ಯಾಬಿನೆಟ್ ಮುಂದೆ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತೇಂತ” ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇಂಥ ಪ್ರಸಂಗಗಳು ಅನೇಕಾವರ್ತಿ ನಡೆದಿವೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಪ್ರಸಂಗಗಳು ನಡೆದು ಅನೇಕ ವೇಳೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಕೈ ಮುಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದಲ್ಲಿ 20 ಜನರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂಥಾ ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ಬಂದಾಗ ಅವರು ಏನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ? ಎಷ್ಟೇ ಸಾರಿ ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೆಲ್ಲ ಆ ಗಂಧದ ಬಾಗಿಲು ಹಿಂದೆ ಹುಳಿತು ತರಲಿ ಒಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನೀವೇನು ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಲ್ಲಾ? ಬರ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ನಾನೀಗ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದೆಲ್ಲ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ಮೇಲೇ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಒಂದಾವರ್ತಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶಿವಮೂರ್ತಿ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿಗಳು ಆ ಗಂಧದಮರದ ಬಾಗಿಲಿಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕ್ಯಾಬಿನೆಟ್ ರೂಮಿಗೆ ಸಚಿವಾಲಯ ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೊಂದು ಜ್ಞಾಪಕಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂತು. ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ಸಚಿವರುಗಳ ಸಭೆ ನಡೆಯತಕ್ಕ ಆ ಸಚಿವಾಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಗುಂಪಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತರಾದ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ರೈತರ ಹಿತವೆಂದಕ್ಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಸಕ್ತಿಯುಳ್ಳವರು ಇದ್ದೂ ಸಹ ರೈತರಿಗೆ

ಅಗತ್ಯ ಈ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲವಲ್ಲಾ ಎಂತ ಆರೋಪಿಸಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆ ಬಿಡಾಪುರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ ಬರಗಾಂತ್ರಿ ಹೆಸರಿನಿಂದ ಆ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತ ಜನರಿಗೂ ಹೆಸರುವಾಸಿಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಂಥಾ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಿಂದ ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತ, ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತರಾದ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿದ್ದರೂ ಈ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ ರೈತನಿಗೆ ತಪ್ಪಲ್ಲ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಡೆ Penalty for bringing infected animal to market" ಅಂತ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬ ಒಂದು ದಿವಸ ನಾಳೆಗೆ ಆತನ ಒಂದು ರಾಸನ್ನು ಹೊತಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ದಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ದನಕ್ಕೆ ಕುಂದುರೋಗ ಬಂದಿದೆ, ಆತ ಆ ಕೂಡಲೇ ಡಾಕ್ಟರಿಗೆ ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತಾನೆ. ಆಗ ಡಾಕ್ಟರಾದವನು ಅದು ಕುಂದು ರೋಗವಲ್ಲ ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಆಗ ಆ ರಾಸನ್ನು ಆತ ನಾಳೆಗೆ ತಂದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಪ್ಪಿಸ್ತಾರೆಯೇ? ಹೀಗೆ ಮೊನ್ನೆ ತಾನೇ ಆ ಗುಬ್ಬಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ದನಕ್ಕೆ ರೋಗ ಬಂದು ಅದನ್ನು ಅಸ್ತಿತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋದಾಗ ಆ ದನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದ ರೋಗ ಚಪ್ಪೆ ರೋಗ ಅಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಆ ಡಾಕ್ಟರ್ ಅದನ್ನು ಹಿಂದಿ ರೋಗ ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಿದರಂತೆ. ಇಂಥಾ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರು ಏನು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ವಾಸ್ತವಾಂಶಗಳು ಹೀಗಿಲ್ಲಾ ಇರುವಾಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಆ ದಡ್ಡ ಜನರ ಮೇಲೆ ತೊಂದರೆಗೀಡಾಗುವ ಶಾಸನಗಳನ್ನು ತರಬಾರದು. ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಕಡೆ Penalty for placing Carcass of infected animal in river ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನನ್ನ ಒಂದು ಹನುವನ್ನು ಯಾರೋ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಿ ನದಿ ದಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊತಿಸಿ ಕೊಂದುಹಾಕಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಆ ವಿಚಾರ ನನಗೆ 4-6 ದಿನಗಳಿಂದ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆ ದಿನಗಳು ಕಳೆದ ನಂತರ ಆ ಬಾದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿಕ್‌ಪೋಜ್ ಆದಮೇಲೆ ಡಾಕ್ಟರುಗಳು ಈ ಹನುವಿಗೆ ನೋ ಬಾಯಿ ಆಗಿತ್ತು, ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಹೀಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊತಿಸಿಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆಂತ ಹೇಳಿಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಆಗ ನನ್ನ ಗತಿಯೇನಾಗ ಬೇಕು? ಹೀಗಿಲ್ಲಾ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ರೈತನಿಗೆ ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಬೇಕು. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕೈಗೆ ದಡ್ಡ ಜನರನ್ನು ಸಿಕ್ಕಿಸಿ ಅವರ ಶಿರಚ್ಛೇದನ ಮಾಡಿಸಬೇಡಿ ಎಂತ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು Penalty for disintering Carcass of a diseased animal ಈ ಕಾಯ್ದೆಗೆ ಬಂದರೆ ಇದ ರಿಂದ ರೈತನಿಗೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಭಾರಿ ಪಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟೇ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸ್ತವ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತಮ್ಮ ವಾದವನ್ನೇ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಈ ಕಾಯ್ದೆಗೆ "ನಾವು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಮೂರು ಕಾಲುವೆ" ಎಂತ ಮಾತ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವಾದಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೋಗಿ ಬೇಡಿ ಎಂತ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾವು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ಆರೋಪಿಸಿ ಮಾಡಿ ನೋಡಿ. ಹಂಸಕ್ರೀರನ್ನಾಯದಂತೆ ಅನಾನುಕೂಲವಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಯ್ದೆಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಬಿಡಿ. ಹೀಗೇ ಈ "Penalty for sale or transfer of infective animals" ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೂ ಅನೇಕ ರೈತಭಂದವ ಸಂಸಾರಗಳಿವೆ. ಅವರೇ ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಅವರ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಕರ ಮನೆಗೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾಗ ಅವರು ಗಾಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ದಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಎತ್ತಿಗೆ ರೋಗ ಬಂದ ರೇನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ? ಇಲ್ಲಿ Penalty for sale or transfer ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆಗ ಅವರು ಬರುತ್ತಿರುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಧ ದಾರಿಯಲ್ಲೇ ದನವಿಗೆ ರೋಗ ಬಂದುಬಿಡುತ್ತೆ. ಆ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿದ್ದರೂ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಖರೀದಿ ಬರುತ್ತೆ. ಮಾರಿಬಿಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆ ಎತ್ತನ್ನು ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬ ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾನೆ. ಇಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಆ ರೋಗದ ಎತ್ತನ್ನು ಕೊಂಡವನಿಗೆ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೋ-ಮಾರಿದವನಿಗೆ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೋ? ಯಾರೋ ಹೆಣ್ಣು ಕೇಳಲು ಒಂದು ಮನೆಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಾರಂತೆ ಇಬ್ಬುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ. ಆ ಹೆಣ್ಣನ್ನು ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಥವಾ ಲಗ್ನವಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಆ ಹೆಣ್ಣಿಗೆ ಇಂಥ ರೋಗವಿದೆ ಎಂತ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಆ ಹೆಣ್ಣನ್ನು ಕೈಬಿಡಬಹುದು. ಹಾಗೇ ಎತ್ತನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಂಥ ರೋಗವಿದೆ ಎಂತ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಕೈಬಿಡಬಹುದು. ಹೀಗಿಲ್ಲಾ ನಾನಾ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳಿವೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಭೂಪಾಲನ ಕೃಷಿಗೆ ಶಿರಚ್ಛೇದನ

(ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ)

ಮಾಡಲು ಶಕ್ತನ ಹಾಗೂ ಗೋಪಾಲನ ತರಕೊಡಬೇಡಿ ಎಂತ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು Penalty for Vexatious entry, etc. ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾ ಅವರ ಮೂಲಕ ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ನರಸಿಂಹರಾವರೂ ಎರವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ವಿಚಾರಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸುಧೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಅರೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಖರ್ಚು ಕಾಜುಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿರುವುದರ ಪರಿಣಾಮದಿಂದ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತೆಂದರೆ ಈ ದನ, ಕುರಿ, ಕೋಳಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಕತಕ್ಕ ಜನರು ದಿಗಿಲಿಬಿದ್ದು ಈ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲ ಸಾವೇಕೆ ಗುರಿಯಾಗಿ ಬೀಕೆಂದು ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಕುವುದನ್ನೇ ಕೈಬಿಡತಕ್ಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾತ ರಾಜಯ್ಯನವರು ದನ ಕುರಿ ಕೋಳಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಚಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೂ ಜನರು ಸಂಸಾರಿಗಳಾಗಿರದೆ ಗುಂಡ್ರೋವಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಬಾಳಲು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಉತ್ತೇಜನ ಕೊಡುವ ಹಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ನಾನೀಗ ಈ ಕಾಜುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕ ಈ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆ ತೀವ್ರತೆಯೊಂದಿಲ್ಲದೆಯೇ ಅದನ್ನು ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಪೊಲೀಸರಿಗೆ ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಮೇಲೆ ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾದ್ದೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅವರ ಪ್ರಾಬಲ್ಯ ಯಥಾ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಹಿಂದಿದ್ದ ಹಾಗೆ ಈಗಲೂ ಇದೆ. ಈ ಇಂಟಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ.ಡಿ. ಜಿತ್ತಯ್ಯರ ಕೈಲಿದ್ದರೆ ತಾನೆ ಏನು? ನಾಳೆ ಅವರು ಈ ಸ್ವಂತಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕುಳಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿ. ಆಗ ಇದರ ಪ್ರಭಾವ ಅವರಿಗೂ ತಪ್ಪುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ವಾರಂಟ್ ಬೇಡ ಏನೂ ಬೇಡ ಏಕೆಂದು ಬಂದು ಅವರು ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಆಗಿರಲಿ ಅವರನ್ನು ಆರಿಸ್ತೇ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಸರ್ ಮಿಷನ್, ದಿವಾನ್ ಮಾಧವರಾವ್, ಸರ್ ಆರ್ಕಾಟರು ಇವರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಇದ್ದಾಗ ಹೇಗೆ ಪೊಲೀಸರು ಆರಿಸ್ತೇ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೋ ಹಾಗೆ ಈಗಲೂ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಲ್ಲದವ ಜನರು ಹಿಂದಿದ್ದ ಪೊಲೀಸರನ್ನು ಇವರಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ವಾರಂಟ್ ಬೇಡ, ಆರ್ಟಿಕಲ್ ಬೇಡ, ಮಾತಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಆರಿಸ್ತೇ ಒಂದೇ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ಅರಾಜಕತೆ ತರಬೇಡಿ ಮೆರೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದೆ ಆ ಗಾಂಧಿ ಭಕ್ತರು ಈಗ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ಆದಳೆವನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದಮೇಲೆ ಏನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಈ ಗಾಂಧಿ ಭಕ್ತರು ಯಾವ ಸೇವೆವನ್ನೂ ಪಾಲಿಸದೆ ಗೌರವಸ್ಥರನ್ನು ನೀವಾ ಪೊಲೀಸರ ಕೈಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟುಬಿಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ರೀತಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಕೊಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ಇದನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅತಿವಿನಯದಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. With all seriousness I am putting before the House. I am appealing to the Government.

ಅದಕೊನ್ನರ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಆರಿಸ್ತೇ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಸಬ್ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರು ಹತ್ತಿರವಿರಬೇಕು. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಮಾನ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆ ಕೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಜನ ಆಪಾದನೆ ಹೊರಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಸಬ್ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರಿಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಬೇಡ, ಯಾಕೆಂದರೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಪೊಲೀಸರು ಆಳವಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ದಸ್ತಗಿರಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ II class magistrate ವಾರಂಟ್ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಸೂಕ್ತ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಮಾಡಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಶಾಸನದ ಕಡಿತ್ತಕ್ಕೆ ಏರಿಸಬೇಕು. ಇದಲ್ಲದೆ ಈ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನು ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಅನೇಕ ನ್ಯೂನತೆಗಳನ್ನು ದೂರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಅತಿ ವಿನಯದಿಂದ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವ ನೌಕರರು ಮಾರಮೇಲರಾದರೂ ಸೇಡು ತೀರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅಂಥವನಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದು ಆಪಾದನೆಮಾಡಿ ಚಾರ್ಜ್‌ಷೀಟ್ ಹಾಕಿ ಪೊಲೀಸರು ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಈ protected clause, 34th clause ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕೈಹಾಕಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಈ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಮಾಡಿ ದನಗಳು ಇವೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ

ಮನೆಯೊಳಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಹೋಗಿ ಹೆಣ್ಣು ಮಕ್ಕಳ molestation ಮಾಡುವುದು? ಇಂಥಾದ್ದು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ. Suppose you molest a girl, what happens? I am putting it bluntly and seriously. This thing is happening everywhere.

ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ್ಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಿ. Decent ಆಗಿ ಕೊಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಕ್ರಿಮಿನಲ್ ಪ್ರೊಸಿಜರ್ ಕೊಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ molestation ಪದ ಹೇಗೆ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ? Is it indecent. ಈ ಮನೆಯ ಕಾನೂನು ಆಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೊದಲು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಂದ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆಸ್ತು ಅನ್ನಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೊದಲು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿತ್ತು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದುದು ನನ್ನ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಪದ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ not dignified? ಈ ಪದ ಸುಪ್ರೀಂ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಜಡ್ಜ್ ಮೆಂಟ್ ನಲ್ಲಿ molestation outraging the modesty of a women ಪದಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಅಲ್ಲವೇ? ಈ molestation ಎಂಬ ಪದ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುವುದರಿಂದ ತಮಗೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಅವಮಾನವಾಗುತ್ತದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಪದ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬಿಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮನುಷ್ಯನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಪಡದೇ ಇರುವ ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಕಾಡಹರಟೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The Speaker cannot say this. How is it irrelevant?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order, order. He cannot question like this. ಸಭೆಯ ಫನತೆ ಗಾಂಭೀರ್ಯ ಮೀರಬಾರದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I can question. How do you say that it is a wrong word, what are the provisions under which you say so. What are your powers? If I am wrong please tell me how I am wrong.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—He should not behave like this. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು: ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಬಿಲ್ ಸಂಭಂದವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಅವರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ನಿಕ್ಕಾಪಟ್ಟಿ ಪದಗಳನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿ molestation ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು, ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ವ್ಯತಿರಿಕ್ತವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ್ಗೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಫನತೆ ಗೌರವ ಕಾಪಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅದು ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಆಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆ ವಿತ್ತುವುದು ಮತ್ತು ದೋಷಾರೋಪಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಕಾನೂನಿಗೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಏನು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಇಂಥಾದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕ ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದು ಕಾನೂನಿಗೆ ವ್ಯತಿರಿಕ್ತವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—Molestation ಪದ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿದರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ dignity ಇಲ್ಲಾ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಕಾನೂನು ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಿ ಕಾಮದ ಹನಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹೀಗೆ ವಾದಮಾಡಬಾರದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಒಂದು ಮಾತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಸರ್ವಥಾ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ. Protection of officers taking action under this Act. ಎಂದು ಏನು ಇದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡಿ ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳೇ ಆಪ್ತರಾದರೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಏನು ಪರಿಣಾಮ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ)

ವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಯಾಕೆಂದರೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಅವಾಂತರವಾಗಿ ರೈತರಮೇಲೆ ದುಷ್ಪರಿಣಾಮವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ಲೇಸ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

"No person shall be entitled to any compensation in respect of the destruction of any animal or thing or of any other loss, injury, detriment or inconvenience caused to him by reason of anything done under this Act in good faith".

ಈ ಪ್ರೊವಿಷನ್ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಸರಕಾರ ಕಾಂಪೆನ್ಸೇಶನ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾಕೆಂದರೆ ಪ್ರಾಣಿನಂಪತ್ತು ನಾಶಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಪರಿಹಾರಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ಪ್ರಾಣಿನಂಪತ್ತು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ dual policy ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಪ್ರಾಣಿನಂಪತ್ತು ಗೋನಂಪತ್ತು ಬೆಳೆಸಿ ದೇಶದ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಆತಂಕಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತವೆ. ಇದು ಕಾನೂನು ಆದರೆ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನಾಹುತವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕೊನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಮಾತು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ, ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಡುವಾರದು ಎಂದು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ದೋಷ ನಿವಾರಣೆಮಾಡಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಕಾನೂನುಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಅತಿ ವಿನಯದಿಂದ ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Sir my friends have covered most of the points. I wish to submit a few things for the consideration of the House. For any law to be successful, it must not only be a good law but the other party which has to obey the law should be well-educated, must be conscious of their rights and liabilities. We see the spectacle of so many legislations coming to utter disaster because there is no mutuality between the law of the State and the people. This law is certainly a good piece of legislation. It is long overdue. But then the people may not be conscious of their responsibilities. They are to be educated. I agree with the suggestions put forward by my hon'ble friends that in the initial stages, any law which has some rigorous provisions, must be leniently enforced to a certain extent because the people on whom responsibilities have been cast under the provisions of the law may not be conscious of their duties and liabilities for a certain period. This is one of the points which the Government will have to bear in mind before the rigorous provisions of the law are enforced. But then the Government has also certain responsibility in the matter before the people can be expected to follow the provisions. Before the Veterinary Department can come up to the standard, we must have very good hospital buildings, adequate medicine in the hospitals and, more than all these things, qualified personnel to man the hospitals. It is then and then only that the people who are to benefit from these things will have confidence in Government. Now, let us see whether we have got these things in our State. It is true that we have progressed fairly enough; I do not say that we are not progressing at all. In many cases, we have got our own buildings. Some of the hospitals are housed in rented buildings and in rooms. I do not know what exactly is the

percentage of hospitals which have no buildings at all. I personally pursued this matter to a certain extent. What I found was that if the buildings are to be put up, the people come forward with their contribution. The Department is not responsible for the construction of buildings at all. I do not know how a hospital can be run without a building. In many backward areas, there are no hospital buildings at all. The people have come forward and requested the Government to put up the buildings, but the buildings cannot be put up under the rules by the Government unless the people come forward with their contribution. So, they have no hospital buildings at all. What is the remedy for this? In certain areas where there are enlightened and rich people, the buildings are forthcoming but where there are no enlightened and rich people and where the areas are backward, buildings are not forthcoming at all. Of course, now things are better with regard to medicine. It is not so bad as it was before but it has not come up to the standard still. I know that in many cases we have no qualified Veterinary Surgeons. More than that, there are no Stock Men and Compounders. I am one of those who have been bawling aloud that in this State the condition of the personnel is not what it ought to be. Their pay scale in spite of the revision has not come up to the standard of that prevailing in the neighbouring States. That is the standing complaint. The pay scale of Veterinary Officers in Madras, Andhra, U. P. and in almost all over India is much better. The Hon'ble Minister for Veterinary Department must have tried his level best but he has not been able to bring the pay scale of these officers to the level which is prevailing in the neighbouring States. I know that several students have left the Veterinary College which was started last year and joined the Medical College. So, in spite of our having a College and in spite of all the propaganda have carried on in this behalf, we have not been able to encourage our youths to join this college. So, the chronic difficulty of dearth of personnel still prevails because the conditions of service of the veterinary personnel are not what they ought to be.

I want to say one thing with regard to the Stock Men. Most of our dispensaries are staffed with Stockmen. I do not know why the selection of Stockmen is given to the Public Service Commission. I agree that the conditions of service, weightage and other things should be there. I know that last year the P.S.C. took an inordinate time to advertise and select the students. Cannot the Government entrust this matter to some other authority as it has been done in the case of selection of students to the Medical and Engineering Colleges? The selection must be done quickly. Why should the P. S. C. come in the way of selection of people for being trained as Stockmen? When hundreds of our dispensaries are without Stockmen or Compounders—I do not understand. Even in such petty matters the Government have not yet awoken to their responsibilities by taking away these powers from the P. S. C. and entrusting them to some other authority in order to quicken

(Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY)

the selection of Stockmen. These are the matters which ought to be attended to before we can say that we are trying to improve the veterinary service or our cattle wealth.

Now, I fully agree that this piece of legislation is necessary. But there are certain harsh provisions which my friends have pointed out which need some looking into. I, as a lawyer, am not going into all the provisions in order to point out minor defects here and there but one or two difficulties which I thought ought to be looked into.

Now, clause 28 is there in practically every legislation and it ought to be there because there are good and bad officers. So, some provision must be made for the sake of these bad officers. But I do not understand sub-clause (2) which says that 'No prosecution under this section shall be instituted after the expiry of three months from the date on which the offence has been committed'. I should like the House to read this sub-clause along with sub-clause (2) of clause 34. They seem to be conflicting. It is also said that no prosecution can be launched without the consent of Government. How does the Government reconcile all these things? For every prosecution, the Government must sanction; for the sanction to be obtained, the party must move the Government and under sub-clause (2) of clause 28 no prosecution lies after the expiry of three months. Suppose I am an aggrieved party and I move the Government for sanction and Government takes 6 months to give sanction, under sub-clause (2) of clause 28, no prosecution lies. How am I to reconcile these matters? The whole thing seems to be confusing.

3-30 P. M.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—The Hon'ble Member must be aware that such a provision exists in the Bombay Act and it is working very well.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—I have not stated that it is not found anywhere else.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—It is actually in force in the Bombay Karnatak area.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—I have not read the Bombay Act. If no sanction of the Government is necessary to prosecute an officer. I can understand that. Is sanction necessary and if the Government has to be moved, how can that be done within three months? It is not possible. If it is a question of mere trespass, I can understand that action can be taken under the I. P. C. Therefore, I think sub-clause 2 will stand in the way and it is not at all practicable. If the Hon'ble Minister can assure us that no sanction is necessary and within three times prosecution has to be instituted. I can understand that.

I have objection with regard to sub-clause (2) of clause 34. If any act has been done by a Government servant in good faith. I do not think there is any offence at all. If in the due discharge of his duties an officer commits an act, it is not an offence at all. In no case can a private party get sanction of Government to prosecute such an officer. So, this sub-clause is absolutely not necessary.

One word with regard to clause 30. In actual practice I think this clause would work as a hardship. While framing law we must also think of extreme cases because we must make provision for every contingency. After all, why should police officers intervene here. We have given power to the Veterinary officer and he can go and get a bailable warrant. Supposing a vindictive officer wants to harass a person, he can go to a police officer and obtain warrant of arrest. We must visualise such things and we must make provisions for such things. So, clause 30 is not necessary and it may lead to enormous difficulties in later stages.

With these words I agree with the general provisions of the Bill.

†Sri N. RACHAIAH (Minister for Agriculture).—Sir, I am very thankful to the Hon'ble Members for having supported this simple and important Bill. Some doubts have been expressed with regard to certain provisions incorporated in this Bill. This is a Bill to bring about uniform legislation. The Government, by experience, have been convinced that the provisions contained in this Bill are necessary. No difficulty has been experienced by the farmers in any part of the State while implementing similar provision contained in the existing Acts.

The Leader of the Opposition expressed a doubt for having incorporated the word "may" in clause 5.

"The State Government may for the purpose of preventing the outbreak or spread of any contagious or infectious disease in or from any area, by notification."

This word already exists in the present Act. The Hon'ble Member expressed that the Government have inherent power to notify in such cases and so the word "may" need not be included. The provisions contained in clauses 28 and 29 have already been existing in the existing Acts and the Government have not heard of any difficulty being experienced by the farmers. These are provisions about which the Hon'ble Members have expressed great apprehension, and have expressed that it is not desirable to incorporate these clauses. Actually, these provisions are already found in the Bombay and Coorg Acts and they have been welcomed by the people. Unless we make a provision as in clause 29, I do not think the officers will be alert and will implement the Act impartially. There must be a sense of responsibility in the minds of officers implementing this Act. As such

(Sri N. RACHAIAH)

there will be no difficulty at all. So, there should be no cause for any apprehension in the minds of the Hon'ble Members.

Regarding the powers of police officer:

"Any Police Officer not below the rank of a Sub-Inspector may, at the request in writing of a Veterinary Officer, arrest without warrant any person who has been concerned in any offence under this Act."

After all the police officer is going to take cognisance of the offence on the written complaint of the Veterinary Officer. So, there need not be any apprehension.

The Veterinary Officer will examine the case with due care and responsibility and it is only when he is convinced that the person is going to violate this provision that he will actually place before the police officer in writing.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—If a person fails to make a report the Veterinary Officer can ask him to be arrested without warrant. It looks very very vigorous.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—We cannot object to such provisions. When it is given in writing, it is the responsibility of the Veterinary Officer and if he misuses the powers under this Act, he will be liable to be prosecuted.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—After sanction by Government.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—In the case of any Government Officer, sanction of Government is necessary and here also I think it is necessary. Nobody can file a case against a Government Officer while he is discharging duties of Government sincerely and impartially. It is only a safety clause and there need not be any apprehension at all.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Even this is contrary to Criminal Procedure Code which prescribes that a Police Officer can only arrest any person who commits a cognizable offence. So, this conflicts with the provisions of the Criminal Procedure Code. I do not think it is sustainable.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—It is already obtaining in the Coorg Act.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—But nobody has challenged in a court so far.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—If there is any such difficulty, the Government will not hesitate to move amendments. There is no complaint or representation to Government that this clause is actually harassing the farmers and those promoting cattle wealth. Even the Law Department have fully examined the provisions and these are already in force and they are being implemented without any difficulty.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Will the Hon'ble Minister give us information as to how many have been arrested under this Section in Coorg?

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—The Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition knows that there is Untouchability Act which provides for cognizable offences. How many people have been arrested by the Police Officer so far? The provisions are there but while implementing these provisions the officers will be humane in their actions and there would not be any difficulty at all. The Government are perfectly convinced about it.

The Leader of the Opposition also pointed out that the farmers will be actually fined up to Rs. 100 in every case. That is not so; The discretion is given to the Magistrate or court to fine up to only Rs. 100. It may be one rupee or two or ten rupees. We are not mentioning any specific amounts, as such and it is left to the discretion of the courts, and generally courts also will be very reasonable.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—What about Section 31?

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—If he gives in writing, the court will take cognizance. It is provided in the Act itself. There is no difficulty or apprehension with regard to this. It is also provided in some other Act. Sri Narasimhan and Sri Muckannappa attacked the Government by saying that the Government are bringing forth this Bill to see that the farmers who are promoting or rearing livestock should be punished. That is not the object. In fact, Sir, if a person who has got profit motive were to bring a diseased animal and if that animal comes into contact with hundreds of costly cows and other good animals, for no fault of his, the farmer will have to incur heavy damages. Some times it is ruinous for the farmer for the negligence of another person who has got profit motive. The very principle of this Bill is to protect the interests of the farmer. In these days, people are talking more and more to non-vegetarian diet and so we will have to protect them. Not only will this cause loss to the farmer, but it may also affect the very life of persons who eat the flesh and meat of these animals. Even from that point of view, we have to incorporate these provisions and I do not think there is any difficulty or apprehension in the minds of the farmers. While implementing this newly passed Act, the Government will assure the Hon'ble Member that if there is any slightest difficulty that may be experienced by the farmers, the Government will move an amendments even during the next session. I will assure the Members so much. With regard to the promotion and development of Animal Husbandry Department, certain remarks have been passed by the Hon'ble Members like Sri Muckannappa and Sri Srinivasa Shetty; they were opposing this Bill on the plea that there is no trained personnel and there are no buildings and medicine; unless and until we have got good animals and livestock wealth what is the use of having veterinary doctors and surgeons? What way do the buildings help us? There must be an Act and we must have a good wealth of livestock. Then only, all these things will be provided. The Mysore State has never lagged behind and even today it has never lagged behind. The Officers have done their best and the Government are very much interested in developing the Animal Husbandry Department. We have

(Sri N. RACHAIAH)

also been given topmost priority with regard to the development of animal husbandry, particularly development of poultry, sheep breeding, dairying and all that. So, the charges levelled by the members against Government are baseless. I do not agree with those charges. In fact, they must appreciate the efforts of the Government in this field because our State is second to none with regard to the development of Animal Husbandry and providing veterinary services to the farmers and also people of the State. Even with regard to service conditions, if the Hon'ble Members were to see the orders that have been passed with regard to new pay scales, they will find that the Government have considered it with great sympathy. The pay scales of these officers have been very low. Now we have raised from Rs. 75 to Rs. 175 in the case of Veterinary Inspectors. Of course, Sri Srinivasa Shetty was telling me just now that South Kanara was very backward and Hyderabad Karnatak was very backward. How do you answer that? That situation is not obtaining in other States. There was no question of integration. There were no such problems of integration in other States and they were able to improve the conditions. That does not mean that the Government will keep quiet. We will certainly consider such claims in the interest of the development of these Departments and we do consider their claims at the appropriate time. Anyway, taking into consideration the State's resources, we have done our best to do justice even in the case of claims of officers pertaining to the Veterinary Services and also Animal Husbandry Department.

Sir, with these few remarks, I am sure that the Hon'ble Members have been convinced about the importance of this Bill and I repeat, if there is any harassment or difficulty or wounding of the feelings of the farmers, Government would assure that they would take immediate steps to amend the provisions which would go against the interest of the farmers in developing the livestock in the State.

Even with regard to the dairy, unless and until we give protection to good animals by segregating and preventing diseased animals, contagious disease and infectious disease, we will not be doing justice. All the provisions have been incorporated in the Bill keeping in mind the best interests of the farmers and also those people who are interested in promoting animal husbandry and dairying.

Sir, I commend the Bill for the kind consideration of the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That the Mysore Animal diseases (Control) Bill, 1959 as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Now the Bill will be submitted clause by clause: Clauses 2 to 27

The question is:

“That Clauses 2 to 27, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted

Clauses 2 to 27 both inclusive were added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Clause 28. There is an amendment by Sri V. Srinivasa Shetty.

SRI V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Sir, I beg to move:

“That in Clause 28, sub-clause (2) shall be deleted.”

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

“That in Clause 28, sub-clause (2) shall be deleted.”

SRI V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Sir, as I have already said, it is not with any motive to oppose the Bill, I am saying this. I do not know, with all the arguments we have put forth on this side. the Hon'ble Minister goes on saying that this provision is found in Coorg and in Bombay. Beyond this, he has not been pleased to say whether any sanction is necessary under clause 28 for prosecuting an officer who has misbehaved. My only submission is that if a sanction is necessary, the whole clause is rendered neugatory. If the Government can assure us that no sanction is necessary to launch a prosecution under clause 28, then we have no objection to retain the present clause as it is, because if clause 2 is there and if sanction has to be taken, it serves no purpose. It is our experience that it takes many months—three months or six months for any private party to get sanction to prosecute an officer. But on the other hand, if Government says that no sanction is necessary because it is an independent offence,...it will be an offence under the IPC—if a person trespasses into a private house and assaults a private party, it is not an offence under this Bill. Then sanction may not be necessary. But it is a doubtful matter. If the Law Department can assure the House that no sanction is necessary and let a private party file a complaint within three months and take his redress in the court. If he fails to complain within three months limit, he will have to suffer for it. But if sanction is necessary then the sub-clause will have to be deleted.

†SRI G. VENKTAI GOWDA.—Sir, apart from the reasons quoted by my hon'ble friend Sri Srinivasa Shetty just now which in my view are very valid, I beg to submit another reason which goes to show that the sub-section (2) would not be sustainable. Clause 28 contemplates the prosecution of officers—penalty for vexatious entry. Supposing an officer commits such an act and complains to the Sub-Inspector of Police or magistrate to take cognisance of the offence, there will be a trial

(Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA)

against the person who is said to have committed that offence. Supposing, the trial takes six months and at the end of it, the Magistrate holds that the entry is vexatious and not warranted, thereafterwards, that person against whom the complaint was made in the court could not proceed with the prosecution for the the simple reason that the time mentioned in sub-clause (2) would have lapsed. Therefore, I submit that any prosecution under this clause cannot be launched at all in such cases. From that point of view, sub-clause (2) deserves to be deleted. This is apart from the reason which my friend Mr. Shetty submitted which is very valid. Therefore my submission is that this sub-clause would not be sustainable under 28 or under 34.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—With reference to the point raised by my friend Sri Venkatai Gowda. I do not see whether any judicial decision is called for in order to lodge a complaint against the officer under clause 28. In that case, he need not wait for the finding of the Magistrate at all.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—What I am saying is, supposing a man against whom complaint is made, keeps quiet till the trial is over and supposing the trial goes on for one year, after that trial will that man have time to launch a prosecution? In such cases, the persons aggrieved have no chance to go before the court for prosecution. From that point of view also, this sub-clause is liable to be deleted.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—Sir, the Hon'ble Member Sri Setty expresses that this is going to harm the interest of the farmers...

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It is not a question of farmers' interests being harmed.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—I know, it is in regard to the prosecution of the officer. Even here Sir, I think the Hon'ble Members have accepted clause 28 (1). When we have accepted that clause, I think there must be some opportunity for the Government whether such a complaint is actually genuine or not. Then only it will be allowed. Even from that point of view, this sub-clause (2) is quite necessary. There is no reason for the Hon'ble Members to entertain any sort of doubts in regard to its working in practice.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Supposing at the Governmental level, there is a delay of more than three months?

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—When we have provided a time limit in the Bill, I am sure you can expect the Government to act quickly.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Then it would be all right if you say here: 'three months exclusive of the time taken by the Government'. If you say that, it will be all right.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—I assure you once again that if there is any difficulty in the working, we are going to move an amendment even in this case. There is no difficulty whatsoever.

4-00 P. M.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—I press the amendment, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That sub-clause (2) to Clause 28 shall be deleted”.

The amendment was negatived

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That Clauses 28 to 33, both inclusive stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted

Clauses 28 to 33, both inclusive were added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There is an amendment to Clause 34.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Sir, I move

“That sub-clause (2) to Clause 34 shall be deleted.”

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

“That sub-clause (2) to clause 34 be deleted.”

†Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—I have already given my reasons why this clause should not remain here. No Government officer is liable to be punished if the officer has done an act in good faith in the discharge of his functions. But no officer will agree or admit that he has done anything in bad faith. In such cases, Government will not hear the party, but hear only their officers. Government will not hold an enquiry in these matters. Whether an act is done in good or bad faith, it is for the Court to find out. Therefore, this clause is unnecessary and detrimental to the implementation of this Bill.

†Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Apart from the reasons given by my friend, I wish to say that if the prosecution sought to be launched is vexatious, under clause 34, Government need not sanction. I do not understand why this provision should be there. I do not understand how the Government feels that the party seeking permission to prosecute an officer is not really grieved and refuses permission. Therefore I fail to understand the retention of sub-clause (2). It should be deleted. It is strange to have such a clause which restricts the fundamental rights of a person. If some person is aggrieved, why should he seek the permission of the Government to prosecute an officer? The Court is there to dismiss the complaint if it is vexatious. Why should the private party be restricted if he wants to prosecute an officer when he feels that something has been done by him in bad faith? This is a clause which I do not think will sustain in law. However clause 34 is there. In view of this, sub-clause (2) is unnecessary.

†Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Is it the view of the Government that section 28 refers to criminal proceedings and section 34 includes both civil and criminal proceedings? Under section 28, you wish to proceed against a party who has vexatiously committed an act. But in sub-clause

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

(2) of 34, you say that "no officer or servant of State Government shall be liable in respect of any such act in any civil or criminal proceedings." Is it the intention of the Government to make a separate provision for civil proceedings? Supposing a party claims damages for acts done beyond the jurisdiction of the officer? I want to ask for clarification.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—To the extent there may be loss, you have to fix up the responsibility. All these questions will be examined by the Government.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—What is the Government going to examine? Are they going to bring an amendment?

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—So long as an officer acts in good faith and discharges his duties as per law, how can he be allowed to be prosecuted?

Sri C. K. RAJAH SHETTY.—The intention of the Government is to simply copy what is provided in the old Acts.

Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum-I).—I just want some explanation from the Government so far as these two clauses are concerned. The first clause of section 34 says that no prosecution shall be made "or other proceedings" without the previous sanction of the Government. May I know whether "proceedings" also include civil liability? Or, to what does it refer? The words "no prosecution or other proceedings" are rather vague "proceedings" mean what? Even if a man puts up an application to Government to sanction prosecution will amount to a "proceeding". By these words "other proceedings" I should like to know what is the intention of the Government to convey. It is not clear. What is the real intention behind all this? Then about sub-clause (2), when sub-clause (1) is there, I think sub-clause (2) is quite unessential. It is no use saying that Government will examine these clauses subsequently and then bring about an amendment. That is not proper procedure or the way in which we have to consider legislation. We have examined every word, every phrase and every clause before we give our sanction or approval for passing of any Acts. After the passing of the Act, to say that amendments will be brought, it is cumbrous. It is really an absurd thing, if I may say so. Before rushing through legislation, I should like to request the Government to examine every clause carefully and it for being passed before this House. It is no use saying that we will examine it subsequently. These two clauses appear to be rather strange. Without Government sanction, nobody can be prosecuted. Sub-clause (2) is practically of the same thing. "No officer...of Government shall be liable in respect of any such act in any civil or criminal proceeding..." After all, it is a Court which has to decide whether any damage is done by an officer. In the second clause also, it is for the Court either criminal or civil which has to decide in these matters. While drafting this clause, there has been some confusion in

the minds of the persons who have drafted. I should like the Government to study carefully and then bring legislation before us and not to rush as it is.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—There is no difficulty at all about the incorporation of this provision. As such, Hon'ble Members need not entertain any doubt at all. We examined it thoroughly before we incorporated it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That sub-clause (2) of Clause 34 shall be deleted”.

The amendment was negatived

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That Clause 34 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted

Clause 34 was added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Clause 35. There is an amendment. But it is out of order. The Hon'ble Members can speak on the clause, but he cannot move the amendment.

†Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—I wish to say one or two words, having tabled the amendment under clause 35. Naturally some limitation is necessary. This clause 35 says that all actions, criminal or civil, must be brought within six months. Where is the guarantee that the Government will give sanction within six months? There is no duty cast on the Government to give sanction within a fixed period? I can understand the provision if there is some duty cast, some liability cast on the part of the Government to give sanction within 2, 3, 5 months. Suppose they don't give sanction within a particular period; the whole thing becomes derogatory. I can understand if you say that after the sanction is given, the party must file his action within a certain period. Unless there is duty cast on the Government also to give sanction within a certain period, the other limitation is useless. Give him the number of days or months, but the limitation must begin to run from the date of sanction. Hence I oppose the clause.

†Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I hope with regard to this particular clause, the Minister will not put forward the excuse that it is already in the existing bill and that it is in operation. You fix a date of limitation and that date of limitation should run after a particular date, after the sanction is given. We would not be a party to this. Let the Minister take time and examine and see whether what we are saying is reasonable. We say that these two or three provisions have no right to be there on the Statute Book. I would like the Minister to re-examine this particular provision. Of course, the other two provisions are passed. Let him not raise the bogey of its being already in the Bill and its being in operation.

† Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—This is a question of curtailment of the right that the persons have under ordinary law to get their grievances redressed. Here it is said that no suit shall be instituted against the State Government. If the Government contemplates under clause 34 that even for filing a suit against the Government, Government sanction is necessary, the retention of clause 35 is ridiculous because to proceed against the Government by way of a suit, I do not think the Government will give any sanction at all. How can the Government give sanction to a private individual to proceed against itself. Under clause 34, no prosecution or other proceedings shall be against any officer... In 'other proceedings' institution of a suit also could be included. If we put such an interpretation, even to proceed by way of a suit against the Government, sanction is necessary. Would the Government give sanction for a person to proceed against itself by way of filing a suit? I do not think that is possible. Therefore, the whole clause appears to be absurd and it is to be deleted.

† Sri N. RACHAIAH.—Government will not agree with such presumptions. Even in the Sales Tax Act of 1957 we have provided this very provision. With regard to the responsibility of the officers and even the public, the same principle will be applied. So I do not agree with these arguments.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That Clause 35 stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted

Clause 35 was added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That Clauses 36 to 38, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted

Clauses 36 to 38, both inclusive, were added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That Clause 1, the short Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted

Clause 1, the short Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to Pass

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—Sir, I move :

“That the Mysore Animal Diseases (Control) Bill, 1939, as passed by the Legislative Council, be passed.”

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That the Mysore Animal Diseases (Control) Bill, 1959, as passed by the Legislative Council, be passed.”

The motion was adopted

PONNAMPET NOTIFIED AREA COMMITTEE (CONTINUANCE AND VALIDATION) BILL, 1959, AS PASSED BY THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Motion to consider

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA (Minister for Local-Self—Government).—Sir, I move :

“That the Ponnampet Notified Area Committee (Continuance and Validation) Bill, 1959, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration.”

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That the Ponnampet Notified Area Committee (Continuance and Validation) Bill, 1959, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration.”

† Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—It is a very simple Bill. The term of the Ponnampet Notified Area Committee expired on the 23th July 1958. Then elections were ordered to be held in the month of June 1958 and calendar was issued. Because the returning officer did not scrutinise the various nomination papers he simply adjourned it. It was examined and elections were completed after appointing a fresh returning officer. A higher officer was appointed and the elections were completed before 30th of September 1958. For two months and 4 days, the Council and the President continued in office, even without an extension order being passed by the Government. According to the Coorg Municipality Act, Government has no power to extend the term of office of any Municipality. The matter was brought to the notice of the Government just at the time when 2 months and 4 days were over. Then we did not want to pass any ordinance. Therefore, this Bill is brought to validate all the acts done by the President and the Council for 2 months and 4 days. We did not want to issue any ordinance; there was no hurry about it because they were already in office under the order of the Deputy Commissioner. We brought a Bill and got it ratified by the Legislative Council. Therefore, there is no lapse on the part of the Government. The Council never met and no meeting was held. Though they were in office, they carried on only the day to day administration. In order to